





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,520	02/05/2001	Jari Syrjarinne	944-001. 043	8440
4955	7590 05/26/2004		EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP			APPIAH, CHARLES NANA	
BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2686	//
			DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/777,520	SYRJARINNE, JARI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Charles Appiah	2686				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nety filed s will be considered timety. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. 8 133)				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 M	arch 2004.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	· —					
Disposition of Claims						
4) □ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	-					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_	•				
)	4)					
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/777,520

Art Unit: 2686

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on March 11, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that U.S. Pat. No. 6,678,510 is not prior art, "since it has the same filing date as the application (5 Feb. 2001)", examiner would like to draw Applicant's attention to the fact that the grounds for the non-statutory patenting are: (1) to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by patent and (2) **to prevent possible harrassment by multiple assignees**' and as such while the 6,678,510 patent may not be prior art due to the filing date of the 6,678,510 patent being the same as that of the instant application, examiner maintains that the double patenting rejection is justified in that it is to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees and as such the 6,678,510 patent is prior art.

In view of the above the non-statutory double patenting rejection is proper and maintained as repeated below. This rejection is made FINAL.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Application/Control Number: 09/777,520

Art Unit: 2686

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,510. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations of the claims of the instant application are broad enough to be encompassed by the claims of the patent and as such it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of the implement the claims of the instant application for the benefit of ensuring an accurate and stable frequency reference—for time synchronization.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2686

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Appiah whose telephone number is 703 305-4772. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 703 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CA May 21, 2004

> CHARLES APPIAH PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5